

# CCAR Forest Protocols Entity and Project Accounting

July 21, 2008

John Nickerson



# Overview



1. Entity and Project Protocols
  - Descriptions
  - Purposes
  - Comparison of Requirements
2. Ongoing Discussions Related to Protocol Updates

# CCAR's Forest Protocols Entity and Project



- General Principles:
  - Accuracy, Consistency, Transparency, Relevance and Completeness
- Detailed accounting standards
  - Provides step-by-step guidance in measuring emissions and ensures that “a ton is a ton” across different organizations
- Two types: Entity and Project

# Entity and Project Descriptions



- A forest entity may be an individual, a corporation or other legally constituted body, a city or county or a state government agency that owns at least one hundred acres of trees within California. Focus of guidance is on commercial timberlands (modeled long term management plan).
- A project is a planned set of management activities that has a goal of reducing, avoiding, or sequestering emissions on any geographical subset of the entity.

# Purposes of Accounting



## Entity Accounting:

- Provides broad emissions trends
- Useful in assessment of activity-shifting leakage

## Project Accounting:

- Demonstrates coherent reduction independent of other emissions trends on project areas
- Are often undertaken for trading purposes
- Demand a higher level of rigor

# Protocols for Biological and Non-Biological Accounting



## Entity Accounting

- General Reporting Protocol addresses non-biological emissions associated with harvesting equipment and transportation.
- Forest Sector Protocol addresses biological carbon fluxes associated with fluxes in forest carbon stocks

## Project Accounting

- Forest Project Protocol addresses biological fluxes associated with project activities (reforestation, avoided conversion, forest management)

# Comparison of Requirements in Sector and Project Protocols



	Entity	Project
Permanent plot monuments	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Field verification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Sampling methodology	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Required carbon pools	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Minimum diameter requirements	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Description of biomass equations	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

# Comparison of Requirements in Sector and Project Protocols



## Confidence Statistics for Estimates of Required Carbon Pools

### Entity

the sampling error of the mean must be within 20% of the estimate of the mean at the 66% confidence interval for the estimate to be accepted by the Registry.

### Project

the sampling error of the mean must be within 5% of the estimate of the mean at the 90% confidence interval for the estimate or deductions apply.



# Entity Reporting Requirements and Protocol Updates



## Discussion Items:

- Entity reporting and verification is expensive and a barrier to project participation
- Entity protocols do not currently address non-commercial forests (oak woodlands, riparian forests off commercial forestlands, etc.)
- Assessment of activity-shifting leakage may not require entire entity – assessment area definition underway

# Entity Reporting Requirements as a State Monitoring Tool



If the goal is to address statewide inventories:

1. Sampling methodologies vary by ownership
2. Costs are prohibitive (sampling and verification):
  - Very high for landowners with current inventory processes
  - Higher yet for landowners with no current inventory process

# Contact Information



John Nickerson

[john@climateresistry.org](mailto:john@climateresistry.org)

California Climate Action Registry  
523 W. 6th Street, Ste. 428  
Los Angeles, CA 90014